

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-18 are pending in the present application. Claim 4 has been canceled and claims 1-3 and 5-18 have been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Abstract was objected to; a Substitute Specification was requested; the title, claims and drawings were objected to; claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph; claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101; claims 1 and 3-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Dalton; and claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Dalton in view of Bairaktaris.

Regarding the objection to the Abstract, a new Abstract has been added. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

Further, regarding the request for a substitute specification, it is respectfully submitted the only changes made to the specification were by adding the proper headers. Therefore, rather than submitting a substitute specification, the headers were merely added into the appropriate places as noted in the Amendments to the Specification of this amendment.

In addition, a new title has been added that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested the objection to the title be withdrawn.

Further, regarding the objection to the claims, dependent claim 6 has been amended to depend on claim 1, rather than on claim 4. Also, it is respectfully noted that claim 8 is supposed to depend on claim 3, which cites the first occurrence of a scan register. The claims have also been amended to correct any minor grammatical errors and to better correspond with the U.S. claim drafting process. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested the objection to the claims also be withdrawn.

Further, regarding the objection to the Drawings, formal drawings are currently being prepared and will be submitted in due course.

In addition, regarding the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the appropriate claims have been amended in light of the comments noted in the Office Action and be definite within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Further, regarding the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 101, the preamble of claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 3-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dalton. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 includes a combination of elements and has been amended to include subject matter similar to that recited in dependent claim 4. In particular, amended independent claim 1 now recites that the method includes dividing an associative register into separate smaller associative sub-registers, allocating one type of logic gate to each associative sub-register, each of which associative sub-registers has corresponding sub-registers connected thereto, and carrying out gate evaluations and tests in parallel on each associative sub-register. Independent claim 16 includes similar features in a varying scope.

Regarding the features recited in dependent claim 4, the Office Action indicates Dalton teaches this feature and cites Figure 6 and col. 2. First, it is respectfully noted the reference Dalton is by the inventor of the present application. Further, applicant respectfully submits notes that Dalton discloses an associative array 1b in which a plurality of logic gates inputs stored. Dalton also discloses a separate and distinct associative array 1a. The associative of array 1b is used to store the values of the inputs to the gates of various different logic types, whereas the associative array 1a stores a record of the type of gates of the corresponding inputs in the associative array 1b. Thus, to perform a test on a particular gate type, for example, an AND gate, Dalton determines from

the entries in the associative array 1a the addresses in the associative array 1b of those inputs that are fed to the AND gates. Dalton then performs tests on the words in the associative array 1b that correspond to inputs to the AND gates, found from those entries in the associative array 1a. This differs from the claimed invention.

That is, in the claimed invention, the associative register 1b (see Figure 1) contains the values of the inputs to the gates. Further, the associative register 1b is further subdivided into a plurality of separate smaller associative sub-registers. Each of these separate smaller sub-registers is allocated one type of logic gate and has corresponding sub-registers connected thereto to allow testing of the gate of the associative sub-registers. Thus, it is possible to perform gate evaluations and tests in parallel on each associative sub-register and to perform tests on all of the gates of one type at the same time by simply performing a test on a particular sub-register because all of the gates are already grouped together in a single sub-register from a part of the larger associative register 1b. Dalton does not teach or suggest these features.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 16 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentable patentably define over Dalton.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claim 2 noted in the Office Action has also been overcome as claim 2 is a dependent claim and Bairaktaris also does not teach or suggest the features recited in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone David A. Bilodeau, Registration No. 42,325, at (703) 205-8072.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph A. Kolasch

Registration No.: 22,463

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments